# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

# RECEIVED

JAN 2 8 2021

Adrian Patterson	U.S. DISTRICT COURT
Petitioner,	MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENN
VS•	) Case No. 2009-cr-47 ) 3:09CR00047 ) 3:16-cv-02623
United States of America	) Chief Judge Crenshaw
Respondent.	)

MOTION FOR REDUCTION OF SENTENCE PURSUANT TO TITLE 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)

COMES NOW, movant/petitioner Adrian Patterson, pro se respectfully request that this Honorable Court Grant a Reduction of Sentence for Compassionate Release pursuant to: Title 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), as amended in the First Step Act (FSA) See P.L. 115-391, 132, Stat. 5194, at Section 603 (December 21, 2018). In light of the COVID-19 Pandemic, medical conditions if exposed to COVID-19 threat to prisoners, immediate emergent cause, leads to an "extraordinary circumstance" befitting a sentence reduction. Under the Authority of this Honorable Court, petitioner humbly prays that this motion be GRANTED.

### NATURE OF PROCEEDING

This motion is brought pursuant to 18 U.S.C.  $\S$  3582(c)(1)(A), which allows that:

"The Court, upon motion of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, may reduce the term of imprisonment, after considering

the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable, if it finds that—

(i) extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant such a reduction;"

A copy of the U.S. Penitentiary Wardens response is enclosed following the Warden's denial of petitioner's Administrative Remedy. Petitioner appealed but no further response to Administrative Remedy were received from F.B.O.P. An emergent cause may be deemed to exist in light of the Corona Virus.

United States v. Powell, 94 Cr. 316, ECF No. 98 (D.D.C. Mar. 28, 2020), waiving exhaustion under § 3582(c)(1)(A) where the Court found that "requiring defendant to first seek relief through the (BOP) administrative process would be futile. Also see Matter of Extradition of Toledo Manrique, No. 19-MJ-71-055, 2020 WL 1307109, at \*1 (N.D. Cal Mar. 19, 2020)(refusing to delay consideration of release to await evidence of an outbreak in the jail because that "may be too late").

F.B.O.P. Policy Statement, #5050.50 and Title 28 C.F.R. 71. 61(a) provided guidance for the administrative remedy and compassionate release requested.

### DISCUSSION

The petitioner is susceptible to a sentence reduction and should be released accordingly.

As such, the Court is directed to Section 1B1.13 of the guidelines by operation of 18 U.S.C. § 3582, which provides that a defendant can establish an extraordinary and compelling reason if he is "suffering from a serious or medical condition... that substantially diminishes the ability of the defendant to

provide self-care within the environment of a correctional facility and from which he is not expected to recover." U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13, cmt.n. 1(A)(ii).

Petitioner asserts that he suffers from Asthma and Hypertension. According to CDC, the following medical illnesses if exposed to COVID-19 would cause him major complications such as (1) lung disease; (2) heart problems; (3) disability; (4) damage to kidneys; (5) ketacidosis; (6) hyperglycemia; (7) hypoglycemia; (8) shortness of breath, difficulty breathing; (9) stroke; (10) heart attack and eventually causing death. Numerous Courts have held release particularly is justified when the inmate suffers from preexisting health conditions that increase the likelihood of a lethal COVID-19 case. Moderate to severe asthma and hypertension are two such conditions. United States v. Gorai, No. 218CR22OJCMCWH, 2020 WL 1975372, at \*3 (D. Nev. Apr. 24, 2020) ("The court finds that defendant's asthma falls squarely within the ambit of preexisting conditions that the [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) have | unambiguously explained place him at a greater risk of COVID-19."); See also United States v. Park, No. 16-CR-473 (RA), 2020 WL 1970603, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 24 2020) (noting that according to the CDC, "people with ailments that cause trouble breathing particularly asthma, ... are at a significantly higher risk;); United States v. Colvin, No. 3:19 CR179 (JBA), 2020 WL 1613943, at \*3 (D. Conn. Apr. 2, 2020).

Petitioner claims that BOP recognizes that he has chronic asthma and hypertension. Prison physicians have consistently

provided him with requisite medications for it. Mr. Patterson's combination of risk factors places him at "extraordinary risk of severe illness and death from COVID-19. United States v. Anderson, No. 15-Cr-30015, 2020 WL 2521513, at \* 5 (C.D. Ill. May 18, 2020)(Defendant suffers from hypertension, a condition that increases the serious risks that COVID-19 presents for Defendant.")

Petitioner asserts that his medical condition makes it impossible for him to provide "social distancing" and other prophylactic measures in a prison environment. Patterson is currently incarcerated at U.S.P. Terre Haute which is a quarantine hub for the North Central Region and has over half of the population infected with the COVID-19 with 9 deaths related to COVID-19. Correctional officers are required to wear their face mask during their entire shifts, but only wears them when the Executive Staff makes their routine rounds. There is no hand sanitizer and it's a shortage on cleaning supplies. The cramped prison conditions and limited protective equipment at U.S.P. Terre Haute are less than ideal during the COVID-19 Pandemic. United States v. Rodriguez, No. 2:03-CR-271-AB DKT. No. 135 (E.D. P.A. Apr. 1, 2020) (Granting release after finding risk factors for COVID-19 constituting extraordinary and compelling reason and noting that prisons are "tinderboxes for infectious disease").

Petitioner asserts in light of the COVID-19, an emergent need to depopulate confined overfull prisons with his medical

programs which Patterson has completed have been demonstrated to significantly reduce the risk of return based upon any recidivist behavior and conduct.

Moreover, petitioner has extensive family consisting of 4 kids, 2 boys and 2 girls, 3 sisters, 1 brother, 1 unlce3 and 3 aunts and an host of nieces, nephews and cousins who all support his release and is planning for his release from prison. If released from prison, Patterson would reside with his sister Katie Allen at 2868 Andersonville Dr. Clarksville, TN. 37082 and would work for Bris Stone Metalfa a Tire Plant.

In addition to the compelling and extraordinary circumstances in Patterson's situation, the Supreme Court said in Pepper, supra, consideration of post-sentence rehabilitation evidence is in fact relevant to several of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors and could support a downward variance. As petitioner was originally indicted with a single count of consipiracy to distribute cocaine, a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841. On September 21, 2011, the US Attorney obtained a superseding Grand Jury indictment charging Petitioner with four additional counts for the contraband and handgun allegedly found during the 2009 West Court bust. (Case No. 2009-cr-47, ECF 192). The Court severed Counts 2-5 from Count 1 but the West Court evidence was still admissible at the Count 1 trial. (Case No. 2009-cr-47, ECF 241, Order, at 3). On February 7, 2012, the Government offered Mr. Patterson a plea deal to settle the entire case, including Counts 2-5, in exchange for a sentence of 17 years. Patterson

rejected the offer because he and his attorney Mr. Strianse believed that the severance would result in automatic exclusion at trial.

During the trial, the court admitted a number of exhibits from the West Court trash pulls and bust, over petitioner's objection. Patterson was later found guilty and the Court sentenced him to "Life" as required by statute. Petitioner has a pending § 2255 motion with the Court arguing had Mr. Patterson known he would have been exposed to Counts 2-5 together with Count 1, he would have probably accepted the governments plea offer.

Furthermore, Mr. Patterson was 851 due to his prior felonies which were all minor. His prior felony convictions could no longer qualify as serious drug felonies because of the laws in Tennessee. Had Mr. Patterson been sentenced today he would only be able to recieve a maximum sentence of 15 years under the First Step Act (FSA) and not the life sentence that is now 25 years. Under these extraordinary circumstances, releasing Patterson early would not materially undermine the goals of just punishment and general deterrence, particularly when balanced against the significant risk to Patterson if he were infected.

Petitioner agrees that the "nature and circumstances" that he was convicted for are serious, § 3553(a)(1), but the Court should assess him as a whole person. Koon, 518 U.S. 81, 135 led 2d 392, 116 S.Ct. 2035 June 13, 1996. Petitioner has already illustrated his behavior as a rehabilitated person and these

condition. Petitioner's current and future potential, are fitting for the sentence reduction pursuant to Compassionate Release.

More importantly, the Court is in no way constrained as to what information it may rely on in determining a new sentence.

See 18 U.S.C. § 3661. Also see Pepper v. United States,\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
U.S.\_\_\_\_, 131 S.Ct. 1229 (2011).

Herein, petitioner is 45 years of age and has been incarcerated for 12 years and has successfully completed treatment and Grehabilatative programs. Likewise, Patterson has voluntarily enrolled in and completed several hours of Adult Continuing Education (ACE) courses in the BOP, while enrolling in the Life Connections Program, the Bureau's most extensive and awarded program. It is an eighteen (18) month faith-based program specializing in spirituality and behavior modification. Patterson has completed over 1000 hours of the program and has completed courses in Comfort Zone Retreat, Building Blocks to a Healthy Community, Preparing for the Journey, Conflict Management, Obligation to Right the Wrong, Religious Tolerance, Managing Emotions, Following your Moral Compass, Family Life Connections, Personal Goal Setting, Drug Abuse Education, Inside/ Out Dads, Tackling Tactics, Anger Management, Victim Impact, Infectious Disease Prevention Seminar, Money Smart, Parenting Class, completed over 500 hours of Community Service for special needs children, Mock Job Fair and Resume Re-entry course to prepare me to enter back into society. Parenthetically, the

factors should suggest to this Honorable Court the characteristics of Patterson today are not as they were at sentencing. Binding precedent establishes that the § 3582(c) decision applies to the person that Patterson is today and this Honorable Court should consider his post-offense developments under § 3553(a), as these provide "the most up-to-date picture" of his history and characteristics. The most up-to-date- picture of Patterson is his change. He is rehabilitated and ready to be a productive citizen in society.

Petitioner claims the "need for the sentence imposed" also appears weaker after over one decade of incarceration. § 3553(a)(2). Patterson has served 12 years in prison. The nature of Patterson's current behavior in prison, suggest incarceration is not necessary "to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant". § 3553(a)(2)(c).

Meanwhile, Patterson's use of prison programming and employment suggest an actual vocation - outside of prison - would best "provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training."  $\S$  3553(a)(2)(D).

Petitioner asserts nor is incarceration the only "kind [] of sentence available." § 3553(a)(3). Non-custodial sentences also curtail "prized liberty interests" and "the defendant always face the harsh consequences that await if he violates the conditions" attached to such a sentence. United States v. Gall, U.S. 38, 51, 128 S.Ct. 586, 169 L.ed 2d 445 (2007).

Furthermore, petitioner asserts that he has satisfied the minimum sentence for his offense, had he not been § 851 or had he been sentenced today under the First Step Act (FSA) should mean that his release will not create a drastic sentencing disparity with defendants "who have been found guilty of similiar conduct." § 3553(a)(6). Petitioner humbly believes that had the Court known his sentence would involve incarceration during a global pandemic in 2020, that is particularly dangerous in prisons for those with Patterson's medical history, it would have been well within it's discretion to resentence him to time served. Petitioner has served 12 years in prison which would not undermine the sentencing factors.

Because the petitioner has identified an extraordinary and compelling circumstance and has clearly availed himself of all available post-sentence rehabilitation programs offered in BOP, it is respectfully submitted that a reduction of the term of imprisonment for Compassionate Release pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A) is indicated.

# CONCLUSION

Petitioner, Adrain Patterson, pro se, prays that this
Honorable Court grants this motion; together with such other
and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

-RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED-

Dated: January 4, 2020

Advain Patterson

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Adrain Patterson, hereby certify that I mailed out this Motion For Compassionate Release pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. 3582(c)(1)(A) through U.S. postal service from U.S.P. Terre Haute, Indiana to the Clerk of the Court for the Middle District of Tennessee on the day of the Middle District of Tennessee on the day of the Middle District of Tennessee on the day of the Middle District of Tennessee on the day of the Middle District of Tennessee on the day of the Middle District of Tennessee on the Day of the Middle Dis

-Respectfully Submitted-

Adrain Patterson U.S.P. Terre Haute

P.O. Box 33

Terre Haute, IN 47808

adrio Patierson



# U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Prisons

Federal Correctional Complex Terre Haute, Indiana

Institution	Region	Central
B/C Unit 🚁	- 228/	

# Receipt of Administrative Remedy

Inmate Name:	PATTERSON, ADRIAN DEWAYNE	Reg. No.:	1 <b>5851-0</b> 75
Administrative Remedy No.:	1043538-1-1		
	day of Oct Margy		_, 2020.
If Administrative Remember by	medy is allowed to be resu , 2020.	bmitted, it is	s due to a Unit Team staff
Edits received by U	nit Team on this	day of	, 2020.
Signature/Title of St	aff		

# Inmate Copy

# REQUEST FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDY

rronr:	Type or use ball-point pen. If attachments are needed, submit four copies. Additional instructions on reverse.						
Part A. INMATE REQUESTIVIBLE the Marden cited under section 18 U.S.C. \$3582(c)(11(A) and 205(g) in his room y request for compassionate release is inaccurate and inappropriate. The First Step Act modified 18 U.S.C. (c)(1(1)(A) in 2018. See P.L. 115-391, 132 Stata. at 603 (Dec. 21, 2018). Section 603 of the First Step Act char process by which \$3582(c)(11(A) compassionate release occurs: instead of depending upon 80P Director's determ on extraordinary and compelling reasons and move for release, a Court can now resentence "upon motion of the arth," after the inmate has exhausted administrative remedies with the B0P or after 30 days from the receipts (inmate's request for compassionate release with the Warden of the Defendant's facility, whichever comes first under the First Step Act, a Court may now consider the Defendant's own motion to be resentenced without waiting to be proposed and order resentencing if the Court finds that extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant a uction and such reduction is consistent with section 3553(a) factors. A.G. 8118 Barr said, "With the changes the compassionate release statute by the First Step Act, Courts need not wait on a motion from the 80P's Directuce a prisoner's sentence under 18 U.S.C. \$3582(c)(1)(A)(i) if extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant a uction and such reduction at Justify resentencing need not involve only terminal illness or dependant care of children. Similarly, Attorney General Barr stated the following in a directive to federal prosecutors across untry: "Vou should now consider the medical risk associated with inforviduals being remanded in federal cust introviduals bound on some of the defendance of the process of the pr	Fram	Adrian Patterson	15851-075	C1	USP Terre Haute		
to my request for compassionate release is inaccurate and inappropriate. The First Step Act modified 18 U.S.C (0(1)(1)A) no 2018. See P.L. 115-391, 132 Stat. at 603 (Dec. 21, 2018). Section 603 of the First Step Act char process by which \$3582(c)(1)(A) compassionate release occurs: instead of depending upon 80P Director's determ on extraordinary and compelling reasons and move for release, a Court can now resentence "upon motion of the ant", after the inmate has exhausted administrative release, a Court can now resentence "upon motion of the inmate has exhausted administrative release, a Court can now resentence "upon motion of the funder the first Step Act, a Court may now consider the Defendant's facility, whichever comes first inmate's request for compassionate release with the Warden of the Defendant's facility, whichever comes first to be made by the 80P. Furthermore, Courts are now authorized to consider a Defendant's motion, even one the 80P opposes and order resentencing if the Court finds that extraordinary and compelling reasons warrant a function and such reduction is consistent with section 3553(a) factors. A.G. Bill Barr said, "With the changes the compassionate release statute by the First Step Act, Courts need not wait on a motion from the BOP's Dire reduce a prisoner's sentence under 18 U.S.C. \$382(c)(1)(A)(A) if if extraordinary and compelling reasons exist. tantly, the reasons that can justify resentencing need not involve only terminal illness or dependant care of continuation of the court of the sentence of the following in a directive to federal prosecutors across untry: "You should now consider the medical risk associated with individuals being remanded into federal cust ring the covid-19 pandemic. Even the extensive precautions we are currently taking each time a new person is CONTINUATION ON ATTACHMENT  **CONTINUATION ON ATTACHMENT**  **CONTINUATION ON ATTACHMENT**  **CONTINUATION ON PRECIONAL DIRECTOR**  **VARDEN OR REGIONAL DIRECTOR**  **VARDEN OR REGIONAL DIRECTOR**  **VAR		LAST NAME, FIRST, MIDDLE INITIAL	REG. NO.	UNIT	INSTITUTION		
If dissatisfied with this response, you may appeal to the Regional Director. Your appeal must be received in the Regional Office within 20 calendar days of the date of this	to my re (c)(1)(A process on extra ant", af inmate's under th it to be the BOP uction a the comp reduce a tantly, children untry: "ring the	equest for compassionate release is inaccurated) in 2018. See P.L. 115-391, 132 Stat. at 6 by which \$3582(c)(1)(A) compassionate release ordinary and compelling reasons and move for the inmate has exhausted administrative request for compassionate release with the refirst Step Act, a Court may now consider made by the BOP. Furthermore, Courts are repoposes and order resentencing if the Court and such reduction is consistent with section assionate release statute by the First Step prisoner's sentence under 18 U.S.C. \$3582(the reasons that can justify resentencing resonance in the section of the reasons that can justify resentencing resonance in the section of the reasons that can justify resentencing resonance in	RECLIA  AUG 28 207  AUG 28 207  AUG 28 207	The First Step Act ection 603 of the F depending upon BOF n now resentence "to or after 30 days ant's facility, who tion to be resente ider a Defendant's nary and compelling G. Bill Barr said, wait on a motion for dinary and compell terminal illness or ective to federal p tals being remanded ty taking each time  SIGNATURE OF	t modified 18 U.S.C. §358 First Step Act changed the Director's determination of the Defence upon motion of the Defence from the receipt of the nichever comes first. The enced without waiting for motion, even one which greasons warrant a redulation waiting from the BOP's Director to the dependent care of minor or dep		
		d with this response, you may appeal to the Regional Director. You	ur appeal must be received in the k	Regional Office within 20 cal	lendar days of the date of this respons		
CASE NUMBER:				CASE NUMBER			
Part C- RECEIPT	Part C-	RECEIPT					

SUBJECT: \_

... to a jail it presents atleast some risk to the personnel who operate that facility and to the people incarcerated therein." Https://www.justice.gov/file/1266901/download On April 3. 2020, A.G. Bill Barr directed the BOP to review all inmates' records. https://www.politico.com/f/?id=0000171-4255-d6b1-c6d51b810000 "We have to move with dispatch in using come confinement where appropriate to move vulnerable inmates out of these institutions." Under previous law, federal prisoners were only eligable for home confinement after they completed 90% of their sentence. However, the new legislation allows for earlier release, if the A.G. formally declares an emergency, which Attorney General Barr has done months ago. "The CARES Act now authorizes me to expand the cohort of inmates who can be considered for home release upon my finding that emergency conditions are materially affecting the functioning of the Bureau of Prisons," Barr wrote, "I hereby make the finding and direct that ... you give priority in implementing these new standards to the most vulnerable inmates at the most affected facilities." Mr. Patterson has illnesses that more than qualifies him for consideration under A.G. Barr's and the CDC's recommendation for consideration. A.G. Barr and the CDC said, "... people with chronic lung disease or moderate to severe asthma, people who have serious heart conditions, compromised immune systems ... obesity." Clearly asthma, hypertension and obesity qualifies due to the fact that it's a respiratory disease that causes shortness of breath. Thus, COVID-19 attacks the lungs causing a person such as Mr. Patterson to require the use of an inhaler due to the use of the inhaler the chemicals that are contained therein causes the immunse system to weaken. To identify an extraordinary and compelling circumstance that could not reasonably have been forseen by the Court at the time of sentencing Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic is such a situation that meets this required criteria. Speaking of which, no Judge, inmate, or citizen in any country around the world would have anticipated as well as forseen that such a deadly virus held in a laboratory in China would be unleashed, escape that laboratory or make an extraordinary leap from bats to humans, whichever story you choose to believe, to spead to swiftly around the world, ravaging countries killing millions of people, devastating economies around the world leaving millions of families, homeless, hungry, destitute, and grieving from the loss of loved ones as well as friends. Could you be more specific about just what these extraordinary steps are when it's clear that you really refuse to mandate and enforce a policy requirement of your medical staff to wear protective gear (mask & Gloves) here at USP Terre Haute to protect the inamtes who are currently in your custody. It's painfully obvious that most BOP employees especially the medical staff here at USP Terre Haute are conservatives. As such, they are of the opinion that to require them to wear protective gear (mask & Gloves) does infringe upon their personal choice and freedoms. I'm a liberal; I don't share their views. Yes, I do agree that they have a right to freedom of choice and personal rights so long as it doesn't infringe upon other peoples right to safety and well being. If they make a concious decision not to protect themselves and it endangers themselves as well as others, than they should be held accountable to those who they have harmed by their actions. Consequently, they shouldn't be allowed to avoid prosecution criminally or civilly by hiding behind an immunity especially when they are repeatedly warned but choose to disregard countless warnings. Furthermore, I really shouldn't be subjected to and have to live with the consequences of your staff member's decisions not to protect themselves because I'm incarcerated, especially when I clearly choose protection. In fact, this decision shouldn't be made for me or forced upon me because I'm incarcerated. A.G. Barr and the CDC said in their criteria recommendation "... conditions of confinement inside the Bureau of Prisons create an optimal environment for the transmission of contagious disease". People who work in the facility leave and return daily. There is support to justify this belief that has recently surfaced when a BOP staff, Officer Pare, here at USP Terre Haute tested positive for COVID-19 two weeks ago. However, this wasn't before she worked in C1 unit possibly exposing the entire unit to COVID-19. In fact, she also exposed a few fellow co-workers during that period, to COVID-19, We know for sure that she tested positive for COVID-19 and has since been guarantined. We aren't really sure of the exact identities of the other officers who were possibly exposed due to the fact that there are several staff members that had worked with her who have disappeared, that we're being told are on vacation. Furthermore, the staff here have been very dishonest and deceptive about the incident. They never informed us about what went on, instead they sent Ms. Skully and two officers to conduct cell-to-cell temperature checks on the inmates in C1 unit to ensure that none of them had a fever. While conducting this temperature check, Ms. Skully received a call from Officer Rainbow telling her to switch to channel 3. Ms. Skully did what was asked of her. Officer Record came back over the radio saying that she might have come in contact with a family member that tested positive for COVID-19. Ms. Skully told her not to say another word because she was currently in C1 unit conducting temperature checks on C1 inmates. Consequently, they could hear what she was saying. Furthermore, the inmates in C1 are responsible for the increase in requests for compassionate releases being filed. It appears that the only extraordinary steps that you're taking to keep inmates safe is to ensure that we remain in the darkness as to when we might possibly have been exposed to COVID-19 by a staff member. What happened to the temperature checks on the staff that were supposed to be conducted prior to entering the facility? Lastly, the potential possibility of being exposed to COVID-19 warrant early release. In fact, several Courts in various Districts share my view. In United States v. Powell, 94-CR-316 E.C.F. No. 98 (D.D. March 28, 2020) stated "waiving exhaustion under §3582(c)(a)(A) where the Court found that requiring a defendant to first seek relief through the [BOPASchildrostrate Occupation to the consideration of release to await evidence of an outbreak in jail because that may be too late."

PATTERSON, Adrian Reg. No. 15851-075 C1

# Inmate Request to Staff Member Response

This is in response to your Inmate Request to Staff regarding a Compassionate Release/Reduction in Sentence (RIS) based on the provisions for Extraordinary and Compelling Circumstances, due to the current pandemic, COVID-19.

After a review of your case, we will not be pursuing a request for compassionate release on your behalf. Among other review factors, Program Statement 5050.50, Compassionate Release/Reduction in Sentence: Procedures for Implementation of 18 U.S.C. §§3582(c)(1)(A) and 4205(g), requires you to identify extraordinary or compelling circumstances which could not reasonably have been foreseen by the court at the time of sentencing. The BOP is taking extraordinary measures to contain the spread of COVID-19 and treat any affected inmates. We recognize that you, like all of us, have legitimate concerns and fears about the spread and effects of the virus. However, your concern about being potentially exposed to, or possibly contracting, COVID-19 does not currently warrant an early release from your sentence. Additionally, a review of your most recent comprehensive medical summary reveals you are not suffering from a debilitating medical condition.

Accordingly, you are not appropriate for RIS at this time. If you are dissatisfied with this response, you may file an appeal pursuant to Program Statement 1330.18, Administrative Remedy Program, within 20 calendar days of the date of this response.

I trust this addresses your concerns.

/1/20

Date

T. J. Watson, Complex Warden

FCC Terre Haute, IN

Remedy No.: 1043538-F1

# **PART B - RESPONSE**

This is in response to your Administrative Remedy receipted August 20, 2020, in which you allege staff erroneously denied your request for a reduction in sentence (RIS). Additionally, you suggest staff are not taking the necessary precautions to prevent the spread of the Covid-19 virus, fail to utilize protective gear and staff do not participate in daily temperature checks. For relief, you request staff submit a motion to the sentencing court on your behalf and request a (RIS) due to your current medical condition and the possibility of you contracting COVID-19.

A review of your request reveals, we will not be pursuing a request for compassionate release on your behalf. As indicated in the original response, Program Statement 5050.50, Compassionate Release/Reduction in Sentence: Procedures for Implementation of 18 U.S.C. §§3582(c)(1)(A) and 4205(g), "an inmate is required to identify extraordinary or compelling circumstances which could not reasonably have been foreseen by the court at the time of sentencing." A review of your complaint indicates you do not have a condition that puts you at a higher risk for COVID-19 as defined by CDC guidelines. In addition, you have not presented evidence of an extraordinary or compelling reason that meets policy requirements to warrant an early release from your sentence.

The BOP is taking extraordinary measures to contain the spread of COVID-19 and treat any affected inmates. We recognize that you, like all of us, have legitimate concerns and fears about the spread and effects of the virus. However, your concern about being potentially exposed to, or possibly contracting, COVID-19 does not currently warrant an early release from your sentence.

Furthermore, all staff have been provided protective gear. There is no evidence suggesting staff are not utilizing protective gear. Additionally, all staff as well as any visitors to the complex are mandated to participate in daily temperature checks. Your claims that staff are not utilizing protective gear and fail to participate in daily temperature checks is without merit, and it is not warranted.

Therefore, this response to your Request for Administrative Remedy is denied.

If you are dissatisfied with this response, you may appeal to the Regional Director, North Central Regional Office, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 400 State Avenue, Suite 800, Kansas City, Kansas 66101. Your appeal must be received within 20 calendar days of the date of this response.

Date

T. J. Watson, Complex Warden

Abrian Ratterson #15851-075 USP Terre Haute P.O. Box 33 Terre Haute IN. 47808

INMATE IDENTIFICATION CONFIRMED

Marchy D. Crenshaw Jr.
Middle District of TN.
801 Brodway-RM. 800
Nashwilk TN. 37203

RECEIVED



Case 3:09-cr-00047 Document 574 Filed 01/28/21 Page 16 of 17 PageID #: 6632

Document 574 Filed 01/28/21